

10/614,968



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,968	07/08/2003	David M. Bashant	END920000147US2	8800

45092 7590 01/30/2006

HOFFMAN, WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO LLC  
75 STATE ST  
14TH FL  
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER

SHAH, SANJIV

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2627

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/614,968

Applicant(s)

BASHANT ET AL.

Examiner

Sanjiv D. Shah

Art Unit

2627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zoltan (Patent # 6,529,917).

Regarding claim 1, Zoltan teaches claimed invention of synchronizing related data elements between two database as shown in fig 4 and described in col. 3, lines 17-24.

A universal identifier corresponding to data element in first and second storage system is described in col. 8, lines 13-18, wherein Zoltan teaches the checksum value which is equivalent to universal identifier, since same values is replicated in both databases as described in col. 6, lines 54-61.

First record identifier corresponding to first database is described in col. 3, lines 43-45.

Second record identifier corresponding to record in second database is described in col. 5, lines 42-43.

Zoltan teaches synchronization between two databases using the universal identifier and record identifiers of the databases as described in col. 2, lines 56-62.

Zoltan teaches all limitation and identifier columns. However, they are not elements of a single key as claimed. They are included in a separate table.

It would have been obvious for a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate different elements in a single key in a table because it provides single tables with multiple identification keys that improves processing performance by reducing time to search multiple tables.

Regarding claims 2-5, Zoltan teaches the claimed invention as described above with respect to claim 1. Zoltan does not specifically teach key comprising data element type or name of the storage as claimed. However it is common practice in the art of database to have a key with data element type or name as is always done in spreadsheet application. An official notice is taken in this regard. Therefore it would have been obvious for a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

utilize well-known technique of utilizing keys with data element type or storage name because it would facilitate the database administrator in retrieving the data based on data type or storage.

Regarding claim 6, Zoltan teaches the claimed invention of table interface and updating the keys as shown in fig 2, element 210 and described in col. 3, lines 4-8.

Regarding claim 7, Zoltan teaches the claimed invention of identifier matching as described in col. 2, lines 57-61. A table update system is described in col. 3, lines 4-8.

Regarding claim 8, Zoltan teaches the claimed invention of accessing information from particular storage as shown in fig 8, element 804 and 806.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 4/25/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant provides affidavits with Exhibit A and Exhibit B claiming that the system was conceived prior to August 14 2000 and therefore argues that the cited prior art Zoltan should be withdrawn. Examiner disagrees. Specifically applicants fail to show where are the claimed limitations described in those exhibits. Exhibit B seems to teach the claimed invention that is created on August 14, 2000 and modified on September 2000, which is later than Zoltan's filing date. Therefore applicant's affidavit **fails to prove that the**


**claimed system was conceived prior to August 14, 2000** as alleged by applicant's arguments. Therefore the rejection is proper.

As per applicant's arguments regarding art rejection, the arguments are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sanjiv D. Shah whose telephone number is (571) 272-4098. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh M. Mehta can be reached on (571) 272-7453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Sanjiv D. Shah  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2627

S. Shah  
January 20, 2006